UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/093,271	06/08/1998	TOSHIYA FUJII	50L1801/897	7030

24272	7590	05/21/2004

Gregory J. Koerner
Simon & Koerner LLP
10052 Pasadena Avenue, Suite B
Cupertino, CA 95014

EXAMINER
HUYNH, SON P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2611	

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

1 6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *20,40 and 43-57* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *20,40 and 43-57* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 June 1998* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

4/22/2004 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Claims 1-19, 21-39, 41-42 have been cancelled.

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20, 40, 43-57 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant requests to provide specific references to support examiner's conclusion of

"obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art" for claims 20, 40, 43, 45, 46, 47, 51 and 53.

Specifically, the format manager copies the page data to create duplicate page data

(claims 20, 40, 45); scroll value is positive when the Internet page data is scrolled down

and negative when the page data is scrolled upwards (claims 20, 40, 43) ; the format

manager recomputes the current position each time the page data is scrolled on the

display device (claims 20, 40, 46); recomputing by combining a prior reference position

and a scroll value (claim 47); horizontal location, vertical location, horizontal size,

vertical size are selectable by utilyzing a remote control device (claim 53); the format

manager automatically reformats the text data and the graphic data from the page data

each time the page data is scrolled on the display.

In response, examiner provides U.S Patent No. 6,184,878 to support "copying

page data to create duplicate page data" (see col. 4, line 65+) as claimed in claims 20,

40, 45; US Patent No (s): 6,222,541; 6,157,381 to support "recomputes the current

position each time the Internet page data is scrolled on the display device" (col. 5, line

55+) as claimed in claims 20, 40, 46; "recomputing by combining a prior reference

position and a scroll value" (col. 9, line 22+) as claimd in claim 47; and scroll value is

being positive/negative when the page is scrolled down/upwards respectively, depends

on the programmer in order to achieve programmer's desired; US Pantent No.(s)

6,510,557 (col. 3, lines 33+); 6,204,485 (figure 12); 5,959,621 (figure 3) to support

horizontal location, vertical location, horizontal size, vertical size are selectable by

utilyzing a remote control device as claimed in claim 53; US Patent No.(s) 5,897,644

and 5,844,620 to support the format manager automatically reformats the text data and

the graphic data.

Applicant also argues Klosterman does not teach downloading "Internet page data",

inserting "video data received from a video programming source"; scrolling of the

background Internet page data.

In response, the above limitations were not cited in the claims filed on 8/25/2003.

Claims 20, 40 recite "copying page data to create duplicate page... inserting a video tag

into the page data... and the page data being scrolldable...." Klosterman discloses a

page data comprises video window 688 and being scrollable by up/down arrows (figure

6d and col. 9, line 54+). Necessarily, the system comprises format manager to format

the page and a processor for processing and the data display on the screen and a video

tag of video window 688 is inserted in the page data as shown in figure 6d.

With regarding claim 44, Applicant argues the cited references fails to teache or

disclose positioning "a video tag to vertically locate the video window on the display

device in relation to a current reference position on the display device".

In response, Klosterman disclose video window 688 is vertically displayed on the

page, the video window can be enlarged (figure 6d and col. 9, line 54+). Necessarily,

the video tag to vertically locate the video window on the display for displaying the video

window 688 vertically. The current reference position can be the borders of the page,

words on the page, etc.

With regarding claim 46, Applicant argues Klosterman fails to teaches scrolling page

data of the background document.

In response, "scrolling page data of the background document" is not recited in the claim.

With regarding claim 48, Applicant argues Judson fails to disclose "video source parameter."

In response, Klosterman disclose video source of video window 688 (figure 6d). Furthermore, Judson discloses object source paramenter (PTO seal , www.uspto.gov/lehman4.gif, etc. – figure 6). Judson further discloses HTTP provides users access to files (which can be in different formats such as text, graphics, images, sound, video, etc.)- col. 1, lines 21+. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Klosterman to use the teaching as taught by Juson in order to display a predetermined object on the page. Therefore, the combination is proper.

With regarding claims 50-52, Applicant argues Coleman discloses television program can be reformatted when the program guide is displayed in a partial screen mode" (col. 3, lines 19-21). Coleman teaches reformatting video programming. Therefore, the reformatting process of Coleman is not reformatting of Internet page data.

In response, Page data is already taught by Klosterman. Coleman teaches reformatting data display on the screen as admitted by Applicant. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Klosterman to use the

teaching as taught by Coleman in order to maximize the use of space on the screen.

Therefore, the combination is proper.

Applicant argues the cited references, in combination with the Official Notice, do not

suggest a combination. Therefore, the obviousness rejections under 35 U.S.C 103 are

improper.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re*

Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Klosterman

discloses page data as shown in figure 6d, the page data comprises video window 688

for displaying video from video source. The video window can be enlarged by clicking

on the video window. The page data is scrollable using up/down arrows (figure 6d and

col. 9, line 50+). Necessarily, the system comprises a format manager for formatting the

page data as shown in figure 6d, a processor for processing and controlling the data so

that page data and video data in window 688 simultaneously displayed on screen; a

video tag for video window 688 is inserted into the page. Alonso discloses copying page

data to create duplicate page (col. 4, line 65+). Therefore, it would have been obvious

to modify Klosterman to use the teaching as taught by Alonso in order to allow page

data developer to work on the page without changing data on original page. Bates

discloses calculating position of the slider of the data page (figures 4-6 and col. 8, line

17+). The scroll value is positive/negative when the page is scrolled down/up depends

on page developer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention as made to modify Klosterman and Alonso to use the

teaching as taught by Bate in order to display data according to new position of the

page thereby allow user to easily control the display.

For reasons give above, the combinations of references for rejection under 35 U.S.C

103 is proper. Therefore, claims 20, 40, 43-57 are rejected as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 43-44, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073).

Regarding claim 43, Klosterman discloses a web page 680 displayed in response to

user selects to connect to the NBC web page. Web page 680 comprises window 688,

which shows the television program that the user was viewing before the user selected

virtual channel 640 from program guide screen 600. The user may resume watching the

television program by clicking on window 688 (see col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 16).

Klosterman further suggests web page 680 is scrollable (see figure 6d). Necessarily, the

system for selectively accessing video data (video program broadcast via satellite 115 –

figure 1) and Internet page data (from Internet site- col. 9, line 25+), comprising:

a format manager for manipulating the video data and the Internet page data, the format

manager providing a video window (688) on a display device for display the video data,

the video window being selectively positionable and sizeable within the Internet page

data (e.g. positioned at the bottom right of the web page and can be enlarge by clicking

on the window). The Internet page data being scrollable with reference to the video

window by utilizing a scroll value (using up/down arrows to move page data and/or

video window up/down – figure 6d);

a processor configured to control the format manager (to perform the function such as

enlarge, moving up/down, etc.) , whereby the video data received from a video program

source (e.g. NBC broadcaster via satellite 115, figure 1 and col. 7, line 5+) and the

Internet page data are simultaneously shown on the display device as PIP window

(figure 6d).

Regarding claim 44, Klosterman discloses video window 688 is vertically displayed on

the page, the video window can be enlarged (figure 6d and col. 9, line 54+).

Necessarily, the format manager positions a video tag (for video window 688) to

vertically locate the video window on the display device (for displaying the video window

688 vertically) in relation to a current reference postion on the display device. (The

current reference position is met by borders of the page, words on the page, etc.)

Regarding claim 54, Klosterman teaches the display device is implemented as a

television device, and wherein the format manager and the processor are implemented

in a set top box coupled to the television device (see figure 1 and col. 4, line 26+).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 49, 53, 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073).

Regarding claim 49, Klosterman teaches the system as discussed in the rejection of

claim 43. Klosterman also shows the video window is located at the lower right corner of

page data (figure 6d), when the user select to enlarge or reduce video window, the

video window is enlarged or reduced horizontally and vertically sizes to a predetermined

size (see figure 6d and col. 9, line 49+). Thus, the video window is selectively size in a

horizontal dimension and in a vertical dimension within the Internet page data.

Klosterman does not specifically disclose selectively position video window in a

horizontal direction and in a vertical direction. It would have been obvious to position

window in a predetermined position on the screen in order to control data displayed on

screen.

Regarding claim 53, Klosterman teaches the video window 688 can be enlarged or

reduced by clicking the window (see col. 9, lines 54-67). However, Klosterman does not

specifically disclose a horizontal location, vertical location, horizontal size and vertical

size of the video window are each selectable by a system user by utilizing a remote

control device. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that horizontal location,

vertical location, horizontal size and vertical size of the video window are each

selectable by a system user by utilizing a remote control device in order to allow user to

adjust the video window to a user desired location and size.

Regarding claim 55, Klosterman teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim

43. Klosterman further discloses the Internet page data is scrollable with reference to

the video window by utilizing scroll value (using Up/down arrows to locate desired

information on the page – figure 6d). Klosterman does not specifically disclose scroll

value is positive when the page is scrolled down, and scroll value is negative when the

page is scrolled upwards. It would have been obvious that scroll value is positive when

the page is scrolled down, and negative when the page is scrolled up in order to

achieve page developer's desire.

8.   Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073), in view of Alonso et al. (US 6,184,878).

Regarding claim 45, Klosterman teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim

44. Klosterman further discloses video window 688 is vertically displayed within the

page data 680 (figure 6d). Necessarily, the format manager positioning the video tag

(for video window 688) within the page data (for page 680) to vertically position the

video window. However, Klosterman does not explicitly disclose copying Internet page

data to create duplicate page data.

Alonso discloses copying page data to create duplicate page for displaying on display

device (col. 4, line 65+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Klosterman to

use the teaching as taught by Alonso in order to allow page data developer to work on

the page without changing data on original page.

9.   Claims 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073), in view of Bates (US 6,157,381).

Regarding claim 46, Klosterman teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim

45. Klosterman also discloses scrolling Internet web page up/down using up/down

arrows (figure 6d). However, Klosterman does not specifically disclose recomputing the

current reference position each time the duplicate page data is scrolled on the display

device.

Bates discloses calculating position of the slider of the data page, the slider position is

typically updated when the slider position changes (figures 4-6, col. 7, line 25+); the

scroll bar position may be specified as an offset from the first position on the scroll bar

(col. 8, line 17+). Necessarily, current reference position is recomputed each time the

page data is scrolled on the display. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Klosterman to use

the teaching as taught by Bates in order to easily control data display on the screen.

Regarding claim 47, Klosterman in view of Bates teaches a system as discussed in the

rejection of claim 46. Bates also discloses calculating position of the slider of the data

page, the slider position is typically updated when the slider position changes (figures 4-

6, col. 7, line 25+); the scroll bar position may be specified as an offset from the first

position on the scroll bar (col. 8, line 17+). Necessarily, the new position is computed by combining a prior reference position and a scroll value to quickly determine the new position.

10.   Claims 20, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073), in view of Alonso et al. (US 6,184,878), and further in view of Bates (US 6,157,381).

Regarding claim 20, Klosterman discloses a web page 680 shown to the user when the user chooses to connect to the NBC web page. Web page 680 comprises window 688, which shows the television program that the user was viewing before the user selected virtual channel 640 from program guide screen 600. The user may resume watching the television program by clicking on window 688 (see col. 9, line 49-col. 10, line 16). Klosterman further suggests web page 680 is scrollable (see figure 6d).

Necessarily, the system for selectively accessing video data (in video window 688) and page data (in web page 680), comprising:

a format manager for manipulating the video data and the page data, the video tag (for video window 688) is inserted into the page data for web page 680.

Klosterman discloses video window 688 is vertically displayed on the page, the video window can be enlarged (figure 6d and col. 9, line 54+). Necessarily, the video tag is selectively positioned to vertically locate a video window (688) on a display device in relation to a current reference position on the display device. (The current reference

position can be the borders of the page, words on the page, etc.), the video window

being repositionable and resizable within the page data on the display device (window

688 can be enlarge by clicking on it);

the page data being scrollable with reference to the video window on the display device

(rolling up and down using up/down arrows to move the page and/or video window up

and down respectively – figure 6d);

a processor for controlling the format manager for controlling the format manager

(moving up, moving down, enlarge, etc.), whereby the video data and the page data are

simultaneously shown on the display device (figure 6d). However, Klosterman does not

explicitly disclose the format manager copying the page data to create duplicate page

data, recomputing the current reference position each time the duplicate page data is

scrolled, the current reference position being computed by combining a prior reference

position and a scroll value, the scroll value is positive when the Internet page data is

scrolled down and the scroll value is negative when the Internet page data is scrolled

upwards.

Alonso discloses copying page data to create duplicate page (col. 4, line 65+).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Klosterman to use the teaching as

taught by Alonso in order to allow page data developer to work on the page without

changing data on original page. However, neither Klosterman nor Alonso specifically

discloses recomputing the current reference position each time the duplicate page data

is scrolled, the current reference position being computed by combining a prior

reference position and a scroll value, the scroll value is positive when the Internet page

data is scrolled down and the scroll value is negative when the Internet page data is

scrolled upwards.

Bates discloses calculating position of the slider of the data page, the slider position is

typically updated when the slider position changes (figures 4-6, col. 7, line 25+); the

scroll bar position may be specified as an offset from the first position on the scroll bar

(col. 8, line 17+). Necessarily, current reference position is recomputed each time the

page data is scrolled. The new position being computed by combining a prior reference

position and a scroll value, the scroll value is positive/negative when the page is

scrolled down/up depends on page developer. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention as made to modify Klosterman

and Alonso to use the teaching as taught by Bates in order to display data according to

new position of the page thereby allow user to easily control the display.

Regarding claim 40, the limitations of the method as claimed in claim 40 correspond to

the limitations of the system as claimed in claim 20 and are analyzed as discussed with

respect to the rejection of claim 20.

11.   Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073), in view of Judson (US 5,572,643).

Regarding claim 48, Klosterman teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim

44. The video window is displayed in a predetermined position on the screen (e.g. et the

lower right corner of the page- figure 6d). Inherently, the window width parameter to

specify a window width of the video window, a window height parameter to specify a

window height of the video window is included. However, Klosterman does not

specifically disclose the video tag includes a video source parameter to indicate a

source of video data for inserting into the video window, a blank window name for

identifying the video window, a horizontal alignment parameter that specifies a

horizontal position of the video window.

Judson discloses discloses HTTP provides users access to files (which can be in

different formats such as text, graphics, images, sound, video, etc.)- col. 1, lines 21+).

Judson further discloses object tag includes a object source parameter ((PTO seal ,

www.uspto.gov/lehman4.gif, etc. – figure 6) to indicate a source of object data for

inserting into the object window; horizontal alignment parameter that specifies a

horizontal position of the object window and information includes fill-in forms (see

figures 5-8, col. 1, line 60+). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Klosterman to use the

teaching as taught by Judson in order to allow the page developer to display the object

at a desired location on the screen.

12.   Claim 50-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073), in view of Coleman et al. (US 5,844,620).

Regarding claim 50, Klosterman teaches a system as discussed in the rejection of claim

43. However, Klosterman does not specifically disclose automatically reformats text

data and graphics data from the page data to optimally utilize a remaining area of the

display device that is not utilized to display the video window, automatically reformatting

the text data and the graphics data from the page data to avoid the video window while

maximizing an amount of the text data and the graphics data displayed on the display

device.

Coleman teaches automatically reformats text data and graphics data from the page

data to optimally utilize a remaining area of the display device that is not utilized to

display the video window, automatically reformatting the text data and the graphics data

from the page data to avoid the video window while maximizing an amount of the text

data and the graphics data displayed on the display device (see figures 6-8 and col. 20

line 59+). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify Klosterman to use the teaching as taught by

Coleman in order to maximize the use of space on the screen.

Regarding claim 51, the format manager automatically reformats the text data and the

graphic data from the Internet page data each time the Internet page data is scrolled on

the display device.

Regarding claim 52, the system of claim 50 wherein the specific pre-determined criteria

for determining how to automatically reformat the text data and the graphics data are

selectable by a system user.

13.   Claims 56-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Klosterman et al. (US 5,940,073), in view of Alonso et al. (US 6,184,878), and further in

Judson (US 5,572,643).

Regarding claim 56, Klosterman discloses video data is received from video sources

(e.g. NBC broadcaster) via satellite 115 (figure 1). a web page 680 shown to the user

when the user chooses to connect to the NBC web page. Web page 680 comprises

window 688, which shows the television program that the user was viewing before the

user selected virtual channel 640 from program guide screen 600. The user may

resume watching the television program by clicking on window 688 (see col. 9, line 49-

col. 10, line 16). Klosterman further suggests web page 680 is scrollable (see figure 6d).

Necessarily, the system for selectively accessing video data (in video window 688) and

page data (in web page 680), comprising:

a format manager for manipulating the video data and the page data, the video data

being received from a television broadcast programming (e.g. distribution center 110 –

figure 1), the format manager providing a video window (688) on a display device

(television) for displaying the video data, the video window being selectively

positionable and sizeable (enlarge or reduce) within the Internet page data (680), the

Internet page data being scrollable with reference to the video window by utilizing a

scroll value (scroll Internet page data 680 and/or video window using up/down arrows –

figure 6d), positioning a video tag (for video window 688) to vertically locate the video

window on the display device in relation to a current reference position on the display

device (video window 688 vertically displayed at lower right corner of the page data

680-figure 6d); displaying Internet page data on the display around the video window,

positioning the video tag (for video window 688) within the Internet page data to

vertically position the video window (figure 6d);

a processor configured to control the format manager (moving up, moving down,

enlarge, etc.), whereby the video data from a video programming source (e.g.

distribution center 110-figure 1) and the page data are simultaneously shown on the

display device (figure 6d). However, Klosterman does not explicitly disclose the format

manager copying the page data to create duplicate page data, the video tag includes a

video source parameter to indicate a source memory storage location of video data for

inserting into the video window.

Alonso discloses copying page data to create duplicate page (col. 4, line 65+).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify Klosterman to use the teaching as

taught by Alonso in order to allow page data developer to work on the page without

changing data on original page. However, neither Klosterman nor Alonso specifically

discloses the video tag includes a video source parameter to indicate a source memory

storage location of video data for inserting into the video window.

Judson discloses HTTP provides users access to files (which can be in different formats

such as text, graphics, images, sound, video, etc.)- col. 1, lines 21+). Judson further

discloses object tag includes an object source parameter ((PTO seal ,

www.uspto.gov/lehman4.gif, etc. – figure 6) to indicate a source memory storage of

object data for inserting into the object window. Therefore it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Klosterman

and Alonso to use the teaching as taught by Judson in order display desired video data

on the screen.

Regarding claim 57, Klosterman in view of Alonso and Judson teaches a system as

discussed in the rejection of claim 56. However, neither Klosterman nor Alonso nor

Judson specifically discloses automatically reformats text data and graphics data from

the page data to optimally utilize a remaining area of the display device that is not

utilized to display the video window, automatically reformatting the text data and the

graphics data from the page data to avoid the video window while maximizing an

amount of the text data and the graphics data displayed on the display device. Official

Notice is taken that automatically reformats data display on a screen when data

displayed on the screen is changed is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

modify Klosterman, Alonso, and Judson to use the well-known teaching in the art in

order to maximize the use of space on the screen.

Conclusion

14.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Campbell et al. (US 2003/0140159) teaches method and system for transmitting and/or

retrieving real time video and audio information over performance limited transmission

system.

Convington et al. (US 5,524,193) teaches interactive multimedia annotation method and

apparatus.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Son P Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-

1889. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Faile can be reached on 703-305-4380. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Son P. Huynh
May 6, 2004

VIVEK SRIVASTAVA
PRIMARY EXAMINER